

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 325

95

SP 007 959

AUTHOR Quie, Albert H.
TITLE Remarks on the Federal Role, Education, and Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION Nebraska Univ., Lincoln.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 6p.
AVAILABLE FROM Paul A. Olson, director, Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. Andrews Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 (free)
JOURNAL CIT Study Commission Newsletter on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers; p29-34 Jun 1973
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Performance Based Teacher Education; Speeches; *Student Loan Programs; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

In this speech, Representative Albert H. Quie (R-Minn.) asserts that 1973 will be one of the most exciting and promising years in higher education. He gives three reasons: a) the repeal of the draft; b) the stabilization of the fiscal crisis of 1970 and '71; and c) the enacting of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, which guarantees every low-and middle-class student a specific level of federal aid. He notes further that the federal government is beginning to put student aid directly in the hands of students, which will have the indirect effect of encouraging colleges to develop programs which meet the needs of these low-and middle-class students. With regard to the budget, he states that the trend is to lessen funding for graduate education in order to equalize the population's access to post secondary education. Representative Quie endorses the Newman Task Force recommendations that mission-oriented teacher training institutions be established and that all credentialling of school personnel be competency based. The speech ends with a note regarding the need to strengthen occupational education and an invitation to teachers and teacher educators to participate more fully in the decision-making process. (HMD)

REMARKS ON THE FEDERAL ROLE, EDUCATION, AND TEACHER EDUCATION

by Albert H. Quie
U. S. House of Representatives

I believe this will be one of the most exciting and promising years in higher education in this nation. There are three factors that contribute to my enthusiasm. First, the draft has ended. Now, for the first time in 20 or more years, the young men who enter colleges will not be there because it offers an escape. True, societal pressure to obtain a sheepskin is still a very real factor in the lives of many young men and women, regardless of their abilities or interests. But if one thing has emerged as a force among students in the past three to five years it is their ability to withstand social pressures and go their own way. Ofttimes that has meant making sandals or growing somewhat illicit agricultural products, but, as often as not, it has meant that more and more young people are finding satisfaction and contentment in vocations which are not white collar executive positions. I hope that trend continues.

The second factor which I find encouraging is that the so-called fiscal crisis of two and three years ago seems to have stabilized. In many cases situations have actually improved. The dire predictions of 1970 that colleges would be closing by the tens have not materialized. True, there have been some closings. But, the number has been small, and the ones which I know of that have closed have not materially weakened American education through their demise. Colleges have learned how to budget, how to manage money flows and how to deal a bit more effectively with faculty, staff and students. Tuitions do continue to rise, but states are becoming more and more interested in assisting all segments of the higher education community, including nonpublic colleges and universities.

Finally, and the reason for my greatest optimism, we will soon put into operation the newest and most revolutionary program of federal assistance to postsecondary education since the land grant college bill of the 1860's. The new program is, as many of you know, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program enacted into law last year as part of the Education Amendments of 1972. This new program should have a revolutionary impact on postsecondary education by guaranteeing every low and middle income student in the nation a specific level of federal grant aid provided he or she is admitted to an accredited institution of postsecondary education. Although the grants in the beginning years will never exceed one-half of need, it is estimated that between 1 1/2 and 2 million students will be receiving aid by the fall of 1974.¹

ED 091325

SP 007 959

This new program also represents a major shift in the federal role in higher education. The trend now is to place funds directly in the hands of the students rather than in the hands of the institution. The effect of this change, which I believe will become even more pronounced in future years, will be to reduce the direct intrusion of the federal government into the internal affairs of institutions and increase dramatically the degree of competition which exists among institutions. If colleges want students they will have to offer programs which are much more attractive to their potential clients. The presence of students with federal funds also has a direct bearing on federal aid to institutions, if and when that provision should be funded.

The Budget for Higher Education

As to the funding of higher education, the picture has some bright signs. In 1972 total grants from the Office of Education for higher education were \$1.24 billion after removal of a one-time extra appropriation necessary to place the Work Study program on a forward funding basis. The President's 1974 budget requests \$1.75 billion, an increase of 40 per cent in just two years, and that figure does not include money for VA programs and other forms of federal student aid such as social security benefits. The increase in student aid funds has been even more dramatic. The total OE appropriation for that purpose in 1972 was \$974 million, again removing that lump sum for Work Study. In 1974 the student aid total will grow, under the President's budget request, nearly 60 per cent to \$1.534 billion.

I would be less than candid if I did not admit to you that hidden within those figures are some significant changes which affect graduate education. With a few isolated exceptions, most federal aid for graduate education is being terminated. The major exceptions are certain programs in the sciences run through the National Science Foundation and some programs operated by the Arts and Humanities endowments. The rationale for the termination is quite simple and reflects a conscious decision on the part of the administration to concentrate its resources and efforts at the undergraduate level with the goal of equalizing access to postsecondary education.² The theory behind that decision is that by the time a student receives a basic undergraduate education, he is roughly equal in earning capacity with more affluent students. There is also the quite legitimate concern that continued federal stimulation of certain graduate programs will only exacerbate a job market situation which is already undesirable.

But all in all, I believe the budget situation is anything but bleak for higher education. With respect to the budget, however, Congress is faced with the vexing issue of how to cope with the President's budget in a way

that enhances the power of the legislative branch. Unquestionably the President is right when he charges that Congress deals with the budget in a piecemeal fashion with no overall perspective. However, there is reason to believe that Congress will soon set its own house in order and find ways to cope with the budget.

A joint House-Senate committee chaired by Rep. Al Ullman of Oregon has been meeting regularly and has issued a set of recommendations which would have each House adopt a total spending ceiling at the beginning of each session. That ceiling would also include targets for each of the dozen or more individual appropriation bills handled each year. To exceed the spending limit on any one bill, a two-thirds majority would have to be mustered. After all appropriation bills had been considered, Congress would consider a final wrap-up bill which would either reduce total appropriations to fit the ceiling or add funds where required. In addition, that final bill would carry with it recommendations for tax increases to finance any excess expenditures or would publicly admit to the need to increase the national debt by a given amount. I believe that this is the right approach. I endorse it with the firm belief that such a system, if adopted, will actually result in more funds for education. In fact it is the only way we can increase substantially federal funds for education.

Newman Paper on Teacher Education

As many of you may know, the Newman Task Force is preparing a paper on teacher education. I am most intrigued with a recommendation made in a draft version of the task force paper which suggests that the federal government should encourage the establishment of mission-oriented teacher training institutions, in contrast to the constituency-oriented programs which generally exist now.³

The Newman paper on teacher education makes another recommendation which I endorse without reservation: that research and development begin immediately on procedures for awarding teaching credentials on the basis of demonstrated competence with the ultimate goal of credentialing all teachers on the basis of competence.

I think that idea has considerable merit and should be expanded into administrative areas as well. I see little reason to make a school district personnel director or assistant superintendent go through the same credentialing procedures as a second grade teacher. I can see credentialing based on competence as having profound and desirable effects on the educational process.

The Need to Strengthen Occupational Education

I have long been an advocate of the need to both increase and upgrade the level of occupational education occurring in the schools. I believe that occupational education takes many forms, from exposure to careers in the lower grades to actual training and on-the-job experience in high school and in postsecondary education.⁴

Two years ago I sponsored a major piece of legislation, the Occupational Education Act, which received strong bi-partisan support in both the Senate and House. That act was included in the Education Amendments of 1972 as part B of Title X of the Higher Education Act. Among its purpose is the development of new and innovative ways to infuse occupational education into the elementary and secondary schools, as well as providing considerable financial support for new programs of occupational education at the postsecondary level.

Unfortunately, the President did not include funds for the Occupational Education Act in his 1974 budget request. However, I intend to work to have those provisions funded and to have new approaches, such as competency certification of occupational education teachers, supported and widely replicated. I would urge each of you to give serious consideration to changing your own programs to make them flexible enough to accommodate short-term classes for those who enter the teaching profession through the competency certification channel. In addition, I would challenge you to develop other ways of training and retraining teachers of vocational education. I am firmly convinced that HEW Assistant Secretary Sidney Marland is right when he says that the general high school curriculum, which, tragically most often leads nowhere, must be eliminated. In its place must come both wider access to postsecondary education and a much greater emphasis on occupational education which will enable a graduating senior to productively enter the labor market.

.....

Teachers in the Political Process

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, I would like to offer a suggestion or two which I hope will result in a greater degree of participation by teachers and those who train teachers in the decision-making process in Washington and in your own state capitals. . . . We need to hear from those of you who have had experience in good programs of individualized instruction as well as those who can discourse with us about the federal role in education and how well the laws already in existence and funded have worked. I would like to see a few selected groups of teachers come to Washington and

talk with those of us who will be dealing with these issues.

I would also like to hear from the trainers of teachers. But, when I hear from you I would like to know that you have actually spent some time recently in the classroom in an elementary school or a high school. I was interested in an article in a recent edition of a university newspaper in the midwest which quoted a number of faculty who had served as substitute teachers for a few days. One was quoted as saying, "It wasn't easy, and I suppose that's why its worthwhile. We owe teachers a great deal more respect and consideration than we give them for the patience and understanding they have in working with children."

The dean of the school of education remarked, "I'm under the impression that somehow we ought to require this kind of participation by as many of our university people as possible. I'm not sure how much that we do equips people to operate in the everyday world." I hope that dean succeeds in imposing that new requirement!

FOOTNOTES

¹Cf. Open Admissions: The Promise and The Lie, a book by the Student Committee of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers which describes what institutions may have to do to make the BOG's work. Available through the Study Commission, Andrews 338, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508. [Footnote by the directorate of the Study Commission.]

²Cf. the analysis of the Cartter and Reuss-Anderson reports (being prepared by William Arrowsmith and Patrick Dolan) for analyses of other federal interventions at the graduate level which may have had an effect on undergraduate education. [Footnote by the directorate of the Study Commission.]

³The Study Commission has also held that many present federal programs serve professionalized constituencies rather than school clients. [Footnote by the directorate of the Study Commission.]

⁴The Career Education program has been placed in OE in the same branch with the old NCIES (National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems) branch; the Study Commission has been developing some input for the dissemination segment of the OE Career Ed work. Cf. the Study Commission document Of Education and Human Community and other career-oriented papers. [Footnote by the directorate of the Study Commission.]

deleted
THIS PAGE WAS ~~REDACTED~~ FROM THE DOCUMENT THAT WAS
SUBMITTED TO ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

SUNY at Binghamton Develops Innovative Projects Board

The Innovative Projects Board at the State University of New York at Binghamton is a Harpur College committee institutionalized in March, 1973. The IPB is an agency responsible for: (1) granting academic credit for innovative courses and individual or group study projects, and (2) approving proposals by individual students for inter-departmental major programs not listed in the college catalog. The Board is made up of five faculty members, three students, and the dean of Harpur College.

Although the IPB is charged with facilitating "innovative" academic challenges, it is only one of several agencies in Harpur College through which such academic work is possible. IPB consults appropriate persons to see whether a given proposal—sponsored by one or more faculty members and submitted to an academic council of a college—may be implemented by a department, school, or committee before the IPB undertakes sponsorship. The IPB can provide resources

or otherwise make possible curricular development that is subsequently formally assumed by departments.

It is difficult to define what is meant by "innovation" in education, but a working definition used by the IPB is: "that which is academically sound but not readily accomplished within the established university structure except through such specially devised faculty-student committees as the IPB."

All proposals to the IPB are submitted on behalf of the applicants by an academic council made up of faculty and students. Participants in IPB's endeavors submit a summary and critical review of their projects. Any faculty members, administrators, or students, as individuals or groups, may submit course proposals. Individual students or student groups may submit proposals for supervised independent-study projects for academic credit, and any student may concurrently submit more than one proposal for individual projects.

UPEP Program Reactivated; Closing Date for Submission Of Proposals Was June 20; Funds to Be Obligated by June 30

The following item appeared in the *Federal Register*, Vol. 38, No. 114, on Thursday, June 14, 1973:

UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL PROGRAM

Notice of Closing Date for the Submission of Applications

The U.S. Office of Education will accept proposals for 1-year grants for the improvement of undergraduate programs for educational personnel authorized under section 531 of the Education Professions Development Act, as amended by Public Law 92-318, the Education Amendments of 1972. Eligible applicants include institutions of higher education, State education agencies, local education agencies, and consortia of the above.

Grants will be made for the purpose of developing and installing alternative programs for the undergraduate preparation of educational personnel that are based upon active cooperation among the public schools, the arts and sciences disciplines and professional teacher education. Proposals must demonstrate that the undergraduate preparation programs will be developed in concert with and show continuing responsiveness to the needs of the schools and the communities they serve. It is expected that activities funded under this program will act

as a catalyst for multiyear efforts using local funds. Expenses covered by these grants will include costs of program development and installation or conversion to the new alternatives from existing training programs and will not include stipends and the costs of the operation of the training activities themselves.

Criteria upon which proposals will be evaluated are:

- The appropriateness of the budget to the statement of work;
- The quality and adequacy of the proposed design;
- The influence and experience of personnel;
- Degree of participation of the schools, professional education, and the faculties of arts and science in both planning and implementing the program;
- Extent to which the proposed design is a clear alternative to the present system; and
- Likelihood that the proposed design will influence the reform of the undergraduate preparation of educational personnel.

Prospective applicants are notified that funds appropriated for this program must be obligated by the Office of Education no later than June 30, 1973. In order to be considered properly completed, an application must be received no later than June 20, 1973. Applications may be obtained from and are to be submitted to the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20202. (telephone 202-962-8176 or 202-962-1292.)

All grants for the support of activities covered by this notice are governed by applicable statutory requirements and will be made subject to standard terms and conditions appropriate thereto. A copy of such terms and conditions are available upon request at the above address.

This notice is effective immediately.

Dated May 21, 1973.

JOHN OTTINA,
Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Approved June 8, 1973.

CASPER W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

[FR Doc. 73-11981 Filed 6-13-73; 10:05 am].

Vol. 2, No. 1, June, 1973

The Study Commission Newsletter is printed by the University of Nebraska Printing and Duplicating Service and is sent to Study Commission members, committee members, Office of Education personnel, directors of Training Teachers of Teachers (TTT) and Career Opportunities Programs (COP), deans and other officers of many universities, some education editors, and others who request it by writing to Paul A. Olson, director, Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Andrews Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508. (Phone 402-472-2602.) Since the Commission is funded under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, this newsletter is sent at no charge. Anything in the Newsletter can be reprinted without permission.